

**Multi City/County Water Resource Assessment Project (MC WRAP)**  
**Meeting NOTES**  
**January 21, 2:00- 4:00**

**Meeting Place:**

**City of Harrisburg City Hall - 354 Smith Street,**  
*(see map and on reverse side)*

**AGENDA**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Ginger Griffith (Scio), Cathy Martin (Scio), Ryan Taylor, Dave Kinney (Scio, Mill City), Denise Walters (Creswell), Jim Minard (Monroe), Jared Rubin Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), Amanda Puntun Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD), Bruce Cleeton (Harrisburg), Pamela Wright (DEQ), Chuck Spies (Lowell), Peter Ryan, Lynne McAllister, Jevra Brown (DSL), Amanda Ferguson (Cottage Grove), Drew Foster (Adair Village), John Gordon (ESA Adolfson), Mirth Walker, Stacy Reed (SWCA), Denise Kalakay, Jacob Callister (LCOG), Kier Miller (Lane County), Adam Stebbins (Benton County).

**1. Introductions 2:00 – 2:10**

**2. Project up-date highlights 2:10-2:35**

**- Work completed to date**

- The EPA grant is in place (almost)
- The Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) has been drafted and is near completion
- A Request for Proposals (RFP) was sent out to select a wetland contractor/s sent out – seven really great proposals returned
  - SWCA chosen for northern group of cities
  - ESA Adolfson chosen for southern group
  - LCOG and the review team feel confident that we have the best
- Base Maps have been generated (with preliminary affected properties in place) (Jake quickly introduced the maps and map layers).
- Preliminary Goal 5 and Goal 6 research has been conducted
- Cities have communicated Project details with city officials
  - Lowell had a good meeting—Council still a little “luke-warm”
  - Creswell and Cottage Grove have officials excited to begin work
  - Other cities have communicated with officials and no other major concerns were identified

**- Things to come (short term tasks to hit field season)**

- Denise reviewed calendar timelines and tight deadlines with the group (See calendar attached)
- First week of March start field season. Emphasis on tight schedule, and critical points (including getting consultant contracts signed and items addressed below)

**3. Community Outreach 2:35 - 3:05**

**- Letters requesting property access –producing labels, getting things mailed,**

- Conversation focused initially on # of and methodology for identifying “affected properties.” LCOG’s methodology of selecting only “VACANT” and “PARTIALLY VACANT” lots was questioned. There was interest expressed in looking at least initially at all lots possible that have Hydric Soils, NWI, DSL Delineations or Determinations (positive), Rivers and Streams.

- It was decided that LCOG staff would produce a “potentially affected properties” layer for each City using this methodology. LCOG will send to both consultants the potentially affected properties layer.
  - Jake presented a protocol for property owner letter mailing between LCOG and jurisdictions (see attached). Conversation regarding letters resulted in slight changes to protocol. Cities discussed the alternative of sending certain property owners more customized letters to address their concerns or interests more specifically. Additionally city reps noted that it would be ideal if property owners were made aware that they can bring letters to City Hall, or bring them to each meeting. Letters will be updated to reflect this.
  - There was discussion regarding whether LCOG envelopes should be pre-postaged or not. Discussion was indecisive. LCOG will likely put postage on letters to maximize response results.
  - Jake noted that it was LCOG’s understanding that no two-week notice was required for public forums, however it would be a good idea to get some general notice out ASAP, and that property owners should have at least a week ideally for notice of the meetings. There was concurrence on this matter.
  - Most communities seemed prepared to utilize the tables LCOG supplies for mail merge themselves, however it was not clear who may need labels made. Jake will follow up with jurisdictions.
  - Meeting dates are still tentative and some Cities have not scheduled any time (Monroe, Adair Village, Brownsville).
- **Outreach materials and avenues (flyers, articles, newspapers)**
    - Example flyers were distributed (see attached) and LCOG will work with cities to finalize flyers and print and make posters.
  - **Meeting format**
    - Cities preferred public meetings start around 7 pm with presentations about the project and the water resource inventory and assessment. City representatives, LCOG, the wetland consultant, and DSL staff need to be at the meetings.

**4. Broad Overview of Statewide Planning Goal 5 and Goal 6 options for riparian inventory, assessment and protection. 3:05 - 3:15**

- Denise briefly reviewed options for riparian areas and discussed briefly the question of whether or not to use the Urban Riparian Area Assessment Guidebook (URIAG) methodology in some or all of the cities. If followed to its end, the URIAG can result in buffer widths of 120 feet in some areas. All cities will have multiple options for how they want to protect their wetland and riparian resources and the URIAG may help with consideration of those options. Southern Cities will have URIAG performed by consultants when doing the initial field work. Cities can decide later on if the URIAG is a useful tool for the northern cities as well. URIAG, Statewide Planning Goal 5, and Goal 6, will be further addressed and discussed in future meetings.

**5. Wetland and Riparian Area Inventory and Assessment 3:15 - 3:50**

- **Introduction to process and methodologies:** Consultants shared insights about process and preparation.
  - John Gordon (ESA Adolphson): Reiteration of process for LCOG’s identification of “potentially impacted lots.” He expressed that where we landed in determining those lots (preliminarily) seemed like a good methodology. John also re-iterated the time crunch for starting the field work in early March. He noted that it is drastically more

accurate and effective to survey during the growing season when the ground is wettest (early March). He also noted that they will likely run two phases: the first to identify and map the wetlands, and the second to assess the wetlands.

- Mirth Walker (SWCA): Addressed the field work element. They plan to see sites in the most efficient way having planned out an approach using base maps. Where there is permission to access, sample plots will be done. Plot should best characterize the wetland. Plots performed using shovels and other hand tools (not backhoes). Agricultural sites are the most difficult sites to locate wetlands on. Wetlands should have all of three indicators of soils, plants, and hydrology but if they have been disturbed (as is often the case in Ag lands) they will often not have all three. If hydrology can not be observed, they often have to default to hydric soils coverage.
- Mirth suggested that the aerials appeared to be summer photos. LCOG noted that the Lane County aerials are Spring flown and will check on the other counties. Mirth suggested that historic aerials, as well as any 1996 flood photos would be appreciated.
- Mirth noted that both consultants will utilize GPS for digitizing in the field— and GPS to navigate throughout the cities. This allows for higher accuracy in mapping and greater convenience in processing field data by entering directly to digital maps, rather than hard copies.
- Each day consultants will review data to make sure it looks right. Ground truths of initial photo interpretations will be conducted. On sites where access is denied, they will try to observe property in best possible manner.
- Standardized info sheets or flyers would be helpful to inform folks of what they are doing. (LCOG should develop an info sheet for consultants to hand out when asked).
- It was confirmed that the public must have an opportunity to review a draft of the LWI.
- John mentioned that the ORWAP (Oregon Rapid Wetland Assessment Protocol) will be conducted in one city by Adolphson --- results will be compared to Oregon Freshwater Wetland Assessment Methodology (OFWAM) by Paul Adamus. Consistency will be important, because OFWAM is the most frequently used, and ORWAP will be a little different. Determining a numerical value for significance will be the big question.

**- Break out time for each group with wetland consultant selected for that group**

- Cities had an opportunity to review city specific maps and visit with consultants. Following are a few notes:
- Harrisburg noted some study area corrections that needed to be made. (removal of one lot and addition of another)
- Adair Village also noted/requested some study area updates to reflect land outside of their UGB. Area to the south and east.
- LCOG is following up on both area updates.
- Scio representatives requested that LCOG prepare some form of press release or project intro and summary for the public outreach.
- Mill City noted some riparian areas that they had recently more specifically identified and requested that they be added as “potentially impacted lots”
- Both consultants confirmed that the newer base maps with the newest “Potentially impacted lots” could be sent in PDF format for their review. LCOG staff will

communicate a review protocol with them to ensure the quickest and most efficient turn-around on conveying the results of that review.

**6. Wrap-up/ Next meeting 3:50- 4:00**

**- Any particular needs or issues not covered? - None**